

REMARKS

**Rejection Summary**

Claims 1-15, 22-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(E)

Claims 16-21, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant respectfully traverses all the outstanding rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal thereof in view of the following remarks.

**Amendments to the Claims**

No amendments have been made to the claims.

Therefore no new matter has been added.

No amendment or argument was made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections**

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), claims 1-15, 22-25 and 27-29 as being anticipated by Muhonen (U.S. Patent Application No. 62005/0181788 A1).

The Office action also rejection, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), claims 16-21, 26 and 30 over Muhonen (U.S. Patent Application No. 62005/0181788 A1) in view of Sundar et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0134636).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In regard to Independent claim 1 an 22, contrary to the Examiner's allegation that all elements are disclosed by Muhonen, receiving a signaling message that includes a rule set associated with a core network; receiving broadcast information including access information associated with a shared network; and applying the shared network information received to the core network rule set to determine a behavior of the user device are not.

Muhonen is directed to allocating a roaming number and routing a call in a shared network. This is simply not the same as receiving a rule set associated with a core network; receiving broadcast information including access information associated with a shared network; applying the shared network information received to the core network rule set as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly independent claim 22. Muhonen discloses the structure of a core network which combines the structure of a GSM system and a GPRS system. The GSM is circuit switched portion while the GPRS is the packet-switched portion. Muhonen further goes on to disclose a subscriber unit roaming in the area of the mobile network 200 (i.e. the shared network). This is not the

same as receiving a rule set associated with a core network. Muhonen is receiving (at the MSC) the registration of the visiting subscriber. This is not the same as the user device receiving a rule set associated with the core network.

Further, Muhonen does not disclose the step of applying the shared network information received to the core network rule set to determine a behavior of the user device. Muhonen discloses at [0040]-[0046] a shared network, a roaming agreement, and situation with a subscriber device that subscribes to operator X, which is not apart of mobile network 200 (Operator A and Operator B). In fact Muhonen teaches away from the present invention at [0042] stating that the “details of how a mobile communication system can be shared are not, however, relevant to the present solution.” Claim 1 and claim 22 are concerned with the operation of a user device in a shared network, and not the method of allocating a roaming number or forming a visitor location register.

Thus, Muhonen fails to disclose all of the features of independent claim 1 and similarly independent claims 22 are therefore in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2- 15, 23-25 and 27 – 29 are therefore also in condition for allowance.

In regard to independent claim 16 and similarly independent claim 21, Sundar fails to make up for the deficiencies of Muhonen as Sundar does not disclose receiving a signaling message that includes a rule set associated with a core network; receiving broadcast information including access information associated with a shared network; nor applying the shared network information received to the core network rule set to determine a behavior of the user device.. Sundar discloses inferring the presence of a WLAN by detecting RF energy in the permitted spectrum [0059]. This is simply not the

same as receiving a signaling message that includes a rule set associated with a core network.

Thus neither Muhonen nor Sundar independently or in any combination thereof disclose, suggest, or teach all of the features of independent claims 16 and 21 and similarly dependent claims 17-20, 26 and 30.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 16 AND 22 define patentable subject matter. The remaining claims depend from the independent claims and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103.

### CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The application, and in particular claims 1-30, is in condition for allowance and a favorable response at an early date is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below. Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **Deposit Account 502117**.

Serial No. 10/680,681  
Page 12

Respectfully submitted,

/DAVID S NOSKOWICZ/

David S. Noskowicz  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 55,503

Dated: March 1, 2007

Phone No. (847) 523-2333

Fax No. (847) 523-2350

Please send correspondence to:

Motorola, Inc.

Intellectual Property

600 North U.S. Highway 45

Libertyville, IL 60048